

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated December 29, 2003, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on March 29, 2004. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8-19, 21-22, 25-40 and 42-44 are pending in the application. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8-19, 21-22, 25-40 and 42 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 1, 10-12, 18, 27-29, 32, 35 and 38 have been amended. Claims 43 and 44 have been cancelled. Applicants submit that the amendments do not introduce new matter. In particular, Applicants submit that the amendments to claims 1 and 18 do not introduce new issues requiring further search since the amendments essentially incorporate subject matter previously recited in now canceled claims 43 and 44.

Claims 1-2, 5, 8-13, 17-19, 22, 25-30, 34-36 and 39-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Adar et al.* (US 6,493,702). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As a formality, Applicants note that claim 41 is not currently pending and therefore cannot be rejected. Regarding the other rejected claims, these claims are directed to creating bookmark information that reflects the sources of individual bookmarks in an environment in which bookmarks are created on a plurality of different sources. The bookmark information received contains source identifier information that identifies the source of the information, i.e., whether it was bookmarked on a lap top computer, a cellular phone, a set-top box, etc. Each bookmark entry is stored with source identifier information that specifies where the bookmark originated. No such functionality is performed by *Adar*.

Adar teaches a system and method for searching and recommending documents in a collection using shared bookmarks. Figure 5 illustrates a user interface window for adding a new bookmark. As explained in the corresponding text (column 8, lines 41-56), a user manually selects a category 512 in which to add the bookmark, enters a bookmark address (e.g., a URL or other identifier), and enters a title 516. By selecting the "Add" button 518, the bookmark system adds the specified bookmark to a list 212. (Column 8, lines 49-51.) Accordingly, neither the user nor the system of *Adar*

associates the bookmarked address with a source identifier identifying the source of the bookmark. As a result, in *Adar*, a user's browser accessing a bookmark receives the corresponding URL (of the bookmark), and nothing else. Specifically, a bookmark source identifier is not returned. Thus, a user accessing a bookmark cannot determine the source of the bookmark, e.g., client device A vs. client device B. In contrast, determination of the source of a bookmark is precisely the kind of bookmark management facilitated by the present invention. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and that the claims be allowed.

Applicants note that the Examiner submits *Adar* teaches, at col. 8, lines 46-49 and col. 12, lines 48-56, a bookmark entry comprising a bookmark network address and an associated source identifier identifying one of the plurality of sources on which the bookmark entry was created. Applicants submit that col. 8, lines 46-49 is precisely one section of *Adar* that makes clear that no bookmark source identification is taught, shown or suggested. Col. 8, lines 46-49 describe the fields of the "Add New Bookmark" window 510 of Figure 5. The only fields provided in the "Add New Bookmark" window 510 are a category field 512 (illustrative categories shown in Figure 5 are news and weather), a network address field 514 and a title field 516. Thus, a source identifier of the bookmark is not contemplated. If the Examiner disagrees, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to specifically point out in what manner the fields of Figure 5 teach a bookmark source identifier as recited in the present claims. Col. 12, lines 48-56 refer to metadata that can be extracted from documents (in the documents repository 118) by the bookmark database 120 and "kept with the bookmarks in the database 120 to facilitate further search options." Thus, the metadata describes the documents being bookmarked, and not the bookmark itself or its source. Accordingly, in no way does the metadata identify the source responsible for generating a bookmark.

Claims 4, 14-16, 21, 31-33 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Adar et al.* (hereinafter *Adar*). Applicants traverse the rejection on the same basis discussed above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and that the claims be allowed.

Claim 37 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Adar* in view of *Smetters* (US 6,560,640). Since Applicants believe *Adar* has been

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920000071US1

overcome for the reasons given above, the combination of Adar with Smethers is also overcome. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and that the claims be allowed.

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)